



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PSALMS OF DAVID AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM ; or, Was David "The Sweet Psalmist of Israel"? By ALEXANDER WRIGHT. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1900. Pp. xvi+249. 5s.

THE purpose of this book, as stated in the preface, is "(1) to vindicate for the Psalms an earlier place in the history of Israel than a certain school of modern criticism is disposed to allow; and (2) to point out that it is reasonable to suppose that David at least wrote certain of the psalms to which his name as author is prefixed." The first three chapters deal with questions of general introduction to the subject; chap. iv is an "Excursus on Certain So-called Davidic Psalms" which the author admits are not the work of David; and the remainder of the book, chaps. v-xxiv, is given to the consideration of the twenty psalms which the author maintains to be Davidic. The book furnishes no contribution to the solution of the problems of the Psalter. It is rather a working over in popular form of the results obtained by such scholars as Ewald, Delitzsch, Perowne, and Robertson. The author seems to have made no use of the more recent works on the Psalms by Duhm, Baethgen, Wellhausen, and others. While professing to place no reliance upon the superscriptions and to determine the date and authorship of each psalm on the basis of its contents, the author seems to lack the thorough understanding of the history of Israel's thought which is essential to any satisfactory work upon the Psalter. The book is marred by the use of faulty English, by inexactness in the citation of references (*e. g.*, pp. 22, 61, 62 note, 68, 104, 122), and by the exceedingly fragmentary character of much of the material. Popular works, such as this was apparently meant to be, are greatly needed, but scholarship and insight are no less essential in their production than in that of more profound and exhaustive works.

JOHN M. P. SMITH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL, with Introduction and Notes. By S. R. DRIVER. (= "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.") Cambridge: The University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1900. Pp. cvi+215. \$0.75.

IN this little volume the reader will find practically all that is known about the book of Daniel. The only recent commentaries, in English, that compare with it in completeness and worth are Bevan's (Cambridge, 1892) and Prince's (Leipzig, 1899), and these cost respectively \$2 and

§3. For the student of the English Bible Driver's book has no rival. For the student of the Hebrew and Aramaic it lacks the philological notes of the larger commentaries.

It is cause for congratulation that a critic of Dr. Driver's reputation has been selected to prepare this commentary on a book so full of difficulties to the average mind. Driver is so fair in his statements that he cannot fail to win many readers to the rational view of the book which he holds. Students of his introduction will not need to be told that Driver here adopts the view of Daniel which has prevailed among the most moderate and reasonable critics of the past quarter of a century—it is a work of religious fiction with a basis in traditional history, and has a Maccabean origin. This is the position taken in the recent dictionaries of the Bible (Hastings and Cheyne).

The introductory matter fills 106 pages; the additional notes and special introductions to chapters occupy 43 pages more. Unfortunately the King James version of Daniel is printed in full, leaving only something over 100 pages for the commentary proper. But these pages are packed with information, and furnish a sufficiently complete exposition of the book. The only general criticism that seems justifiable is one made by Cheyne long ago upon Driver's work (*Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 338, 366 ff.). His caution leads him into excessive deference to the conservative position. For example, he will not say that there is no sufficient evidence for the existence of the hero Daniel in the exile, although his facts carry him logically to that conclusion (pp. xvii f.). This discussion, however, seems to indicate a change from the view maintained in his introduction (p. 510, 9th ed., 1899), where he asserts the existence of an exilic Daniel, while here he says the hero is a patriarchal Daniel living long before the exile. Also on the question of the date Driver says "not earlier than *ca.* 300 B. C." and probably between 168 and 165 B. C., when all other critics with the same data and point of view would say "surely 165 B. C." (*cf. Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 1010). The author holds that Daniel was originally written in two languages in the form in which it has been handed down to us, and maintains, of course, the unity of the book. The last chapters (7-12) he pronounces apocalyptic and includes a most instructive discussion of the apocalyptic literature. He thinks the doctrines of the book (angelology, resurrection, etc.) show only slight traces, if any, of Persian influence. "Antichrist" (11:36-45) is Antiochus, and the New Testament interpretation is, "upon exegetical grounds, untenable." The "son of man" (7:13) is the ideal people

of God and not the Messiah (pp. 102 ff.). The prophecy of the "seventy weeks" admits of no explanation, unless assumptions and corrections are made. It is certainly not, what tradition has held it to be, a prediction of the advent and death of Christ (pp. 144 ff.). The value of the book for popular use is increased by an excellent outline of the period of history from 605 to 164 B. C. There is a good English and Hebrew index.

HERBERT R. PURINTON.

COBB DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Lewiston, Me.

KRITIK DER BEIDEN MAKKABÄERBÜCHER, nebst Beiträgen zur
Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung. Von BENEDICTUS
NIESE. Berlin: Weidmann, 1900. Pp. iv + 114. M. 2.40.

THIS essay presents the results of investigations made by the author while preparing the third volume of his history of the Greek and Macedonian states. His main conclusion is that *2 Maccabees* is more valuable as a historical source than *1 Maccabees*. Naturally, he cannot hold the commonly accepted belief that *2 Maccabees* was written as a sort of pharisaic corrective of the Sadducean tone of *1 Maccabees*. The latter itself Niese regards as falling into two approximate halves. Chaps. 1-7 cover the same ground as *2 Maccabees*, and were in large measure from the work of Jason epitomized in *2 Maccabees*, while the last eight chapters cover a longer period much less fully. This second half is not based on any one source, but contains a large number of documents, which Niese does not regard as genuine. *First Maccabees* also fails, barring one episode, to give any account of the seven years 160 (159)-153 (152) B. C. Other omissions, as in the case of the events immediately preceding the Maccabean outbreak, are also noteworthy. On the other hand, the work makes Judea a sort of center of world-politics. The motive for these omissions and additions Niese holds to have been a desire to present the history of the historian's people in the most creditable light.

One must give the entire position of Niese the most respectful consideration, for the critical problems of the sources of any history of the Maccabean period are very perplexing. Willrich does not agree with Niese, however, and the end of the discussion is not in sight. One feels, however, great hesitation in accepting *2 Maccabees* as superior to first. At the same time, it is also difficult to feel that *1 Maccabees* is not dependent to some extent upon material known